

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>APPENDIX B</b>  <b>EXAMPLES OF GROUND WATER SITE-SPECIFIC USE AND VALUE CONSIDERATIONS</b></p>			
<b>FACTORS</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>	<b>LOW</b>
1. QUANTITY <sup>1</sup>	<p>1. Aquifer(s) in Review Area designated as "High Yield" by State or USGS;</p> <p>2. Aquifer(s) Yield in Review Area &gt; 300 gal/min, or Transmissivity &gt; 4,000 feet squared/day; and</p> <p>3. Above Aquifer(s) threatened<sup>2</sup> by on-site contaminants.</p>	<p>1. Aquifer(s) in Review Area designated as "Medium Yield" by State or USGS;</p> <p>2. Aquifer(s) Yield in Review Area between 100-300 gal/min, or Transmissivity between 1400-4000 feet squared/day;</p> <p>3. Above Aquifer(s) threatened by on-site contaminants.</p>	<p>1. Aquifer(s) in Review Area designated as "Low Yield" by State or USGS;</p> <p>2. Aquifer(s) Yield in Review Area &lt; 100 gal/min, or Transmissivity &lt; 1400 feet squared/day; and</p> <p>3. On-site GW plume not projected to threaten Productive Aquifer(s).</p>

---

<sup>1</sup>If an aquifer is subject to widespread contamination or a massive degree of contamination, these facts may be considered in the assessment of quantity of water available in an aquifer, or in the quality of the aquifer. However, the fact that the CERCLA site itself has contaminated ground water generally does not, taken by itself, support ranking the quality or quantity of the aquifer as low.

<sup>2</sup>Threatened means current or future contaminant concentrations shall require wellhead treatment.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>APPENDIX B</b>  <b>EXAMPLES OF GROUND WATER SITE-SPECIFIC USE AND VALUE CONSIDERATIONS</b></p>			
<b>FACTORS</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>	<b>LOW</b>
2. <b>QUALITY<sup>3</sup></b>	<p>1. Aquifer(s) in Review Area considered drinking water quality; and</p> <p>2. Limited existence of potential sources (non-site) of ground water contamination in Review Area; and</p> <p>3. These High Quality Aquifer(s) threatened by on-site contaminants.</p>	<p>1. Aquifer(s) in Review Area contains background pollutants that can be removed by available PWSS treatment methods;</p> <p>2. Some existence of high risk land use activities (non-site) identified within High Quality Aquifer; and</p> <p>3. Above Aquifer(s) threatened by on-site contaminants.</p>	<p>1. Aquifer(s) in Review Area contains Total Dissolved Solids &gt; 10,000 ppm;</p> <p>2. Aquifer(s) contaminated by naturally occurring substances or widescale human activity beyond PWSS treatment capabilities;</p> <p>3. On-site GW plume not projected to threaten High or Medium Quality Aquifer(s).</p>

---

<sup>3</sup>If an aquifer is subject to widespread contamination or a massive degree of contamination, these facts may be considered in the assessment of quantity of water available in an aquifer, or in the quality of the aquifer. However, the fact that the CERCLA site itself has contaminated ground water generally does not, taken by itself, support ranking the quality or quantity of the aquifer as low.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>APPENDIX B</b>  <b>EXAMPLES OF GROUND WATER SITE-SPECIFIC USE AND VALUE CONSIDERATIONS</b></p>			
<b>FACTORS</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>	<b>LOW</b>
<p>3. <b>CURRENT PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS (PWSS)</b></p>	<p>1. Current PWSS(s) require wellhead treatment due to on-site contaminants;</p> <p>2. PWSS(s), Wellhead Protection Area(s) or Sole Source Aquifer(s) identified within Review Area have water supply sources threatened by on-site GW contamination;</p> <p>3. Alternate water supplies not economically<sup>4</sup> nor technically feasible if current public supply sources become contaminated.</p>	<p>1. PWSSs, Wellhead Protection Areas or Sole Source Aquifers identified within Review Area but on-site GW contamination not projected to threaten such water supplies;</p> <p>2. Complex hydrogeological setting; long term monitoring needed to establish on-and off-site GW contaminant fate and transport.</p>	<p>No Public Water Supply Systems, Wellhead Protection Areas or Sole Source Aquifers identified in Review Area.</p>

---

<sup>4</sup>According to the Sole Source Aquifer Designation Guidance, use of potential sources of drinking water can be considered to be economically infeasible if the annual system cost to a typical user exceeds 0.4 to 0.6% of the mean household income in the area.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>APPENDIX B</b>  <b>EXAMPLES OF GROUND WATER SITE-SPECIFIC USE AND VALUE CONSIDERATIONS</b></p>			
<b>FACTORS</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>	<b>LOW</b>
<p>4. CURRENT PRIVATE DRINKING WATER SUPPLY WELLS</p>	<p>1. Private well(s) require wellhead treatment due to on-site contaminants.</p> <p>2. Identified private well(s) in Review Areas threatened by on-site contamination;</p> <p>3. Alternate water supplies are not economically nor technically feasible if current private wells become contaminated.</p>	<p>1. Based on hydro-geological studies, identified private water supply wells not threatened by site-related GW contaminants;</p> <p>2. Complex hydro-geological setting; long-term monitoring needed to establish on-and off-site GW contaminant fate and transport.</p>	<p>1. No private drinking water supply wells identified in Review Area;</p> <p>2. Private supply wells unlikely because area substantially serviced by PWSSs.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>APPENDIX B</b>  <b>EXAMPLES OF GROUND WATER SITE-SPECIFIC USE AND VALUE CONSIDERATIONS</b></p>			
<b>FACTORS</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>	<b>LOW</b>
<p>5. LIKELIHOOD AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE DRINKING WATER USE</p>	<p>1. Future drinking water sources in Review Area threatened by site contaminants;</p> <p>2. Existing water supply capacity in Review Area shall not meet projected future demand if on-site GW not restored;</p> <p>3. Vulnerable PWSSs not implementing local WHPPs and if contaminated, delivery of comparable GW quality &amp; quantity from alternate sources infeasible.</p>	<p>1. Current WHPAs or designated future water supply protection areas within Review Area not threatened by site contamination but land use activities surrounding such supplies include potential sources of contamination;</p> <p>2. Uncertain whether on-site ground water may be needed as a future water supply source.</p>	<p>1. Existing water supply capacity far exceeds future needs, exclusive of on-site GW restoration;</p> <p>2. Future high valued water sources (e.g. high yield aquifers) within Review Area not threatened by site contamination or other potential sources of contamination.</p>
<p>6. OTHER CURRENT OR REASONABLY EXPECTED GROUND WATER USE(S) IN REVIEW AREA</p>	<p>Current or reasonably expected agricultural, commercial or industrial use of GW in Review Area threatened by site contamination.</p>	<p>Projected uses of GW in Review Area include agricultural, commercial or other beneficial uses, but such uses not threatened by site contamination, and adequately planned for, not including use of on-site GW.</p>	<p>No current or projected uses of ground water identified in Review Area (exclusive of drinking water).</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>APPENDIX B</b>  <b>EXAMPLES OF GROUND WATER SITE-SPECIFIC USE AND VALUE CONSIDERATIONS</b></p>			
FACTORS	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
7. ECOLOGICAL VALUE	On-site GW provides principal hydrologic support for wetlands, surface water reaches, or other sensitive ecosystem(s), and contaminants potentially pose a risk to ecological receptors.	On-site GW contributes a component of hydrologic support for wetlands, surface water, or other sensitive ecosystem(s), or contaminants potentially pose a risk to ecological receptors.	No measurable GW/SW/wetlands interconnections documented on-site or potentially affected off-site.
8. PUBLIC OPINION	<p>1. Substantial public opinion expressing the high value placed on ground water on-site or in the Review Area;</p> <p>2. Public concerned with the need to use on-site GW as a future water supply source, or the potential for on-site contamination to threaten current or future water supplies.</p>	<p>1. Minimal feedback received from the public identifying the high, medium or low "use" and "value" of ground water;</p> <p>2. Low to moderate public concern about future use and value of on-site ground water.</p>	<p>1. Substantial public feedback opposed to the use of on-site GW even if restored;</p> <p>2. Public places minimal value for on-site ground water use; and</p> <p>3. Public provides water resource planning documentation which describes adequate alternate and feasible uses of GW in Review Area, exclusive of on-site GW.</p>